

**From:** "m.steidlmayer@comcast.net%inter2" <m.steidlmayer@comcast.net>  
**Subject:** Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 10/31/2005 09:54 PM CST  
**Date Sent:** 10/31/2005 09:54:02 CST  
**Date Received:** 10/31/2005 09:54:53 CST

---

Email: m.steidlmayer@comcast.net

FirstName: Mark

LastName: Steidlmayer

Address1: Box 411

Address2:

City: Colusa

State: California

zipcode: 95932

Question1: The fulcrum is that benefits are not certain in the long run so the alleged capitalization argument is somewhat mooted and muted. On the other hand young farmers will not enter farming in the face of uncertainty of farm program payouts which more often than not are written for a five year period.

"Lower price land" is but the tip of the iceberg; input costs for USA farmers are out of control and for the crop year 2006, fuel and fertilizer costs, will actually reduce acres to be farmed.

Question2: This is a 'moving target' as other nations will protect their domestic food base at all costs. It is only when that food base cannot meet the needs of the country involved that bilateral cooperation will start. However, the issue will always be skewed by non equal regulations amongst nations and the input costs variance amongst nations.

The reality is that the USA non farm sectors want to buy foreign food so the latter will have the funds to buy their products.

Somehow those USA sectors should 'chip in' some dollars to the question and not expect all of the costs involved to be borne by the farming sector.

Question3: It is said in some quarters that some farmers 'farm the farm programs' with great success.

Farming to scale is as much driven by costs of input than the desire to farm 'the farm programs'.

It is hard to criticize a farmer/family who want to grow. Why should a farmer earn less(as measured in income) than many public officials or those in industries which, in a large part, depend on public funds. What is the USA's defense budget and where do those dollars go?

The goal should be to allow equal opportunity to grow in size, an issue which involves risks not covered by farm programs.

The 'entity' issue needs to be revisited as some are able to play the 'entity card' like a violin where one or husband and wife have the proverbial 'nine lives'.

Question4: The public is attuned and greatly supports conservation and environmental programs.

However, if one were to visit rural areas which benefit from farm programs he/she would find paradoxical hostility toward this aspect of 'farm policy', if that is the program where such policies are to be tucked.

Recreational value resulting from farm policies should be fully explained to all. Recreation, hunting/fishing, is good for the soul much as music and the arts are.

Rural areas, by definition, are where the 'action' necessarily has to be. That is why it is sad that some within the rural areas are hostile to conservation and environmental programs as if such areas should not be asked to contribute to the commonweal in this fashion.

The Farm Program has the existing structure to promote public policies in this area.

Attest: CRP; WRP; Payments on base acres even if not farmed to mention a few.

This is a fertile area to bring about the often mentioned 'win/win' situations by recognizing a farmer's contributions with something other than a 'pat on the back', i.e. with some dollars--doesn't have to be all that much for the benefits received.

Work on it.

Question5: Perhaps the best policy for rural areas would be to provide tax incentives for industries to be there. People will stay in the country if they can earn dollars to support their family and provide them with the basics, schooling at all levels, health care, affordable housing.

The Farm Program, per se, cannot do this as farming is scaling down, way down, in man hours needed. Dollars received by farmers only support "Peoria" and other distant places.

The question is: is it in the USA's long term interest to have our traditional rural areas vibrant? Yes, but issue is not to be born on the back of a Farm Program.

Question6: Tax policy should be used to achieve these goals. This is not something that the Farm Program alone should bear.

All these issues relate to the quality of life of our citizens so the dollars should not come from an earmarked "Farm Program".